



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,927	01/11/2001	David Carroll Challener	RPS920000084US1	9620
45211	7590	11/03/2004		
KELLY K. KORDZIK WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK PC PO BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201			EXAMINER ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER 4
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,927

Applicant(s)

CHALLENGER ET AL.

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on January 11, 2001. Claims 1 – 45 were received for consideration. No preliminary amendments for the claims were filed. Claims 1 – 45 are currently being considered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Paper No. 2, is attached to this Office action.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The acronym for "dialing action controller" is incorrectly given and used as "DTC." This should be corrected to "DAC" as used in the claim language.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 15- 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each of the claims should be concluded by a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 3-5, 15-25, 29, 31-36, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitation "said security protocol" in the first line of the limitation, and refers to claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim 1.
7. Claim 5 recites the limitation "said PIM" in the first line of the limitation, and depends on claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim 1 on which claim 5 refers.
8. Claim 15 recites the limitation "said authorization unit" in the first line of the limitation, and depends on claim 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 13, on which claim 15 depends, or in claim 1 on which claim 13 depends.

9. Claims 15 – 20 recite the limitation “said Modem” in the first line of the limitations.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 13, on which claim 15 depends, or in claim 1 on which claim 13 depends.

10. Claims 21 – 22, 25, and 29 recite the limitation “said DAC” in the first line of the limitation. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 13, on which claim 15 depends, or in claim 1 on which claim 13 depends.

11. Claim 23 recites the limitations “said user signal” and “said connectivity cost” in lines 1 – 2 of the limitation. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 13, or in claim 1 on which claim 13 depends.

12. Claim 24 recites the limitation “said security protocol” in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 13, or in claim 1 on which claim 13 depends.

13. Claim 31 recites the limitation “said PIM” in the first line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 29.

14. Claims 32 – 36 recite the limitation “said Modem” in the first line of the claims. there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 29.

15. Claim 39 recites the limitation "said connectivity cost" in the first line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

16. Claims 1-2, 5-14, 16-30, and 32 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Voit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,275).

Regarding claim 1, Voit discloses:

A method of integrating telephony function with security and guidance features on an Internet appliance comprising the steps of:

selecting a communication access number using a selection means, said communication access number operable to access a communication link via said Internet appliance (column 7 lines 39 – 58, column 12 line 64 – column 13 line 20, column 19 lines 22 – 27);

alerting a user of said Internet appliance when an attempt is made to select said communication link via a dialing action of said Internet appliance using said

Art Unit: 2131

communication access number (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12); and

receiving an authorization for said dialing action by said user of said Internet appliance (column 14 lines 40 – 49, column 17 line 66 – column 18 line 8).

Regarding claim 14, Voit discloses:

A system for integrating telephony function with security and guidance features on an Internet appliance (IA):

one or more personal identification means (PIM) input units coupled to a system bus in said ICA, said PIM input units operable to generate unique PIM signals (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26);

a security protocol circuit operable to encrypt, decrypt, store and retrieve said PIM signals and device driver code (column 9 lines 38 – 55);

a PIM verification circuit operable to receive said PIM signals and compare them to secure predetermined PIM signals, said PIM verification circuit generating a verification signal (column 9 lines 38 – 65);

one or more Modems coupled to a dialing action controller and to communication lines (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9);

said Modems operable to send and receive communication data (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9); and

a dialing action controller (DAC) coupled to said system bus and said Modems, said DAC operable receive a dialing action request and to alert a user of said dialing action and to enable or disable said dialing action to said Modems in response to said verification signal and a user signal (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

Regarding claim 30, Rao discloses:

An Internet appliance, comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU) (Figure 9);

a read only memory (ROM) (Figure 9);

a random access memory (RAM) (Figure 9);

a user interface adapter coupled to a keyboard and a mouse (Figure 9);

a display interface adapter coupled to a user display (Figure 9);

an I/O interface adapter (Figure 9);

a system bus (Figure 9);

a communication adapter (Figure 9); and

a security processor unit, said security processor unit further comprising:

one or more personal identification means (PIM) input units coupled to a system bus in said ICA, said PIM input units operable to generate unique PIM signals (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26);

a security protocol circuit operable to encrypt, decrypt, store and retrieve said PIM signals and device driver code (column 9 lines 38 – 55);

a PIM verification circuit, said PIM verification circuit operable to receive said PIM signals and compare them to secure predetermined PIM signals, said PIM verification circuit generating a verification signal (column 9 lines 38 – 65);

one or more Modems coupled to a dialing action controller and to communication lines, said Modems operable to send and receive communication data (Figure 9); and

a dialing action controller (DAC) coupled to said system bus and said Modems, said DAC operable receive a dialing action request and to alert a user of said dialing action and to enable or disable said dialing action to said Modems in response to said verification signal and a user signal (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

In order to apply prior art rejections to the dependent claims, it was assumed that claims 3 – 13 are dependent on claim 2, claims 15 – 29 are dependent on claim 14, and claims 31 – 45 are dependent on claim 30.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 1 wherein said authorization comprises the sub steps of:
prompting said user to enter a user personal identification means (PIM) in response to selecting said communication access number (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26);

initiating a pre-determined security protocol to retrieve a corresponding secure PIM for comparison (column 9 lines 38 – 55);

correlating said user personal identification means with said secure PIM (column 9 lines 38 – 65);

authorizing or rejecting said dialing action in response to said correlation (column 9 lines 38 – 65);

retrieving secure device driver code for executing said dialing action using said security protocol in response to said authorization;

displaying, if said dialing action is authorized, a connectivity cost alert for said communication link (column 10 lines 13 – 20, column 18 lines 9 – 21); and

executing said dialing action using said device driver code for said communication link in response to said authorization and a user response to said connectivity cost alert (column 18 lines 9 – 33).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein said PIM is used to grant or block access to certain area or country telephone codes (column 17 line 66 – column 18 line 8).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, further comprising the step of:

matching said communication access number with an actual system entered communication access number (column 7 lines 39 – 58, column 12 line 64 – column 13 line 20, column 19 lines 22 – 27).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, further comprising the steps of:

monitoring the incoming call for a caller ID (Figure 7, column 17 lines 22 – 31);

and

answering and routing said incoming call to a receiving device on the basis of said incoming telephone number (Figure 7, column 17 lines 22 – 31).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, further comprising the step of:

using a built-in key escrow function to notify a trusted server of a current dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) assigned IP address along with a key indicating authenticity of transmission so that voice over IP services between devices and a web page server lookup may be performed in a DHCP environment without side-channel communication for call or web reference look-up (column 17 lines 55 – 61).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein activating said selected communication access number comprises selecting said communication access number from a displayed Internet web page hot spot (column 17 lines 41 – 44).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein said communication access number is selected using an actual or virtual keypad of said Internet appliance (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein said communication link comprises a non-concurrent shared dial-up public switched telephone network (PSTN) connection between a telephone connection and an Internet connection (Figure 3. column 8 lines 24 – 32).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein said communication link has separate connections for an Internet connection and a telephone connection (Figure 3. column 8 lines 24 – 32).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein said communication link comprises a concurrent communication link for an Internet and a telephone connection (Figure 3. column 8 lines 24 – 32).

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said Modem comprises: a digital subscriber line (DSL) Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said Modem comprises:
a wireless cellular modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said Modem comprises:
a wireless personal communication system (PCS) modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said Modem comprises: a cable Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 20 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said Modem comprises a public subscriber telephone network (PSTN) Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said DAC alerts said user of a dialing action by display on a user display screen coupled to said IA (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

Claim 22 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said DAC retrieves a connectivity cost and alerts said user of a connectivity cost associated with a requested dialing action if said dialing action is authorized (column 10 lines 13 – 20, column 18 lines 9 – 21).

Claim 23 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said user signal is a response by said user to said connectivity cost alert for said dialing action (column 18 lines 9 – 33).

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said user is given an option of communicating on an established communication link in response to an authorized and enabled dialing action using said security protocol (column 18 lines 9 – 33).

Claim 25 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said DAC uses a built-in key escrow function to notify a trusted server of a current dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) assigned IP address along with a key indicating authenticity of transmission so that voice over IP services between devices and a web page server lookup may be performed in a DHCP environment without side-channel communication for call or web reference look-up (column 17 lines 55 – 61).

Claim 26 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said dialing action request comprises:

entering a communication access number via a keyboard keypad, a virtual display keypad, or by clicking a "hot spot" on a Web page (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26).

Claim 27 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said connectivity cost alert notifies a user of an actual toll call cost for a communication link corresponding to said authorized and enabled dialing action (column 10 lines 13 – 20, column 18 lines 9 – 21).

Claim 28 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein said user is alerted of said dialing action whether said dialing action was initiated locally or remote by another user (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

Claim 29 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 13, wherein DAC monitors incoming communication access numbers and directs communication to a answering or recording device or forwards the communication to another communication link in response to comparing said incoming communication access numbers to a predetermined, stored communication access

Art Unit: 2131

numbers list (column 7 lines 39 – 58, column 12 line 64 – column 13 line 20, column 19 lines 22 – 27).

Claim 32 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said Modem comprises: a digital subscriber line (DSL) Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 33 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said Modem comprises: a wireless cellular modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 34 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said Modem comprises:
a wireless personal communication system (PCS) modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 35 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said Modem comprises a cable Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 36 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 29, wherein said Modem comprises a public subscriber telephone network (PSTN) Modem (Figure 4 item 344, Figure 9).

Claim 37 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said DAC alerts said user of a dialing action by display on a user display screen coupled to said IA (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

Claim 38 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said DAC retrieves a connectivity cost and alerts said user of a connectivity cost associated with a requested dialing action if said dialing action is authorized (column 10 lines 13 – 20, column 18 lines 9 – 21).

Claim 39 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said user signal is a response by said user to said connectivity cost alert for said dialing action (column 18 lines 9 – 33).

Claim 40 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said user is given an option of communicating on an established communication link in response to an authorized and enabled dialing action using data encryption (column 18 lines 9 – 33).

Claim 41 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said DAC uses a built-in key escrow function to notify a trusted server of a current dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) assigned IP address along with a key indicating authenticity of transmission so that voice over IP services between devices and a web page server lookup may be performed in a DHCP environment without side-channel communication for call or web reference look-up (column 17 lines 55 – 61).

Claim 42 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 29, wherein said dialing action request comprises:

entering a communication access number via a keyboard keypad, a virtual display keypad, or by clicking a "hot spot" on a Web page (column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26).

Claim 43 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said connectivity cost alert notifies a user of an actual toll call cost for a communication link corresponding to said authorized and enabled dialing action (column 10 lines 13 – 20, column 18 lines 9 – 21).

Claim 44 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein said user is alerted of said dialing action whether said dialing action was initiated locally or remote by another user (column 9 lines 56 – 67, column 13 lines 21 – 64, column 18 lines 8 – 12).

Claim 45 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The Internet appliance of claim 30, wherein DAC monitors incoming communication access numbers and directs communication to a answering or recording

Art Unit: 2131

device or forwards the communication to another communication link in response to comparing said incoming communication access numbers to a predetermined, stored communication access numbers list (column 7 lines 39 – 58, column 12 line 64 – column 13 line 20, column 19 lines 22 – 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 3 – 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,275) in view of Rao et al. (U.S. Patent 6,757,823).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Voit does not explicitly disclose using the security protocol for encrypting and decrypting information. Rao discloses a Voice over IP (VoIP) system that explicitly addresses security in a VoIP environment. In Rao's invention, a secure registration process is used that exchange information between calling endpoints (column 4 lines 18 – 35). This information includes encryption algorithms, public key information, and digital signatures. Afterwards, the established encryption and keys are used in encrypting future communications (column 4 lines 30-35). This system of encryption can be implemented

in the system of Voit because Voit's system has the capability to support security as it uses the same setup handshake as the system of Rao. Also, the communications between the endpoints is conducted in an analogous fashion. Furthermore, Voit states "security features should be supplied" (column 4 lines 58 – 61) and "communication...is preferably encrypted and secure" (column 9 lines 40 – 45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the specific security features of Rao with the system of Voit to achieve a secure and encrypted communication line between two parties. This authentication would allow for not only the security of the communication lines against hackers, but also allows for the repudiation of the calling parties.

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Voit does not explicitly disclose using the security protocol for encrypting and decrypting information. Rao discloses a Voice over IP (VoIP) system that explicitly addresses security in a VoIP environment. In Rao's invention, a secure registration process is used that exchange information between calling endpoints (column 4 lines 18 – 35). This information includes encryption algorithms, public key information, and digital signatures. Afterwards, the established encryption and keys are used in encrypting future communications (column 4 lines 30-35). This system of encryption can be implemented in the system of Voit because Voit's system has the capability to support security as it uses the same setup handshake as the system of Rao. Also, the communications between the endpoints is conducted in an analogous fashion. Furthermore, Voit states

Art Unit: 2131

"security features should be supplied" (column 4 lines 58 – 61) and "communication...is preferably encrypted and secure" (column 9 lines 40 – 45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the specific security features of Rao with the system of Voit to achieve a secure and encrypted communication line between two parties. This authentication would allow for not only the security of the communication lines against hackers, but also allows for the repudiation of the calling parties.

18. Claims 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,275) in view of Gullman et al. (U.S. Patent 5,280,527).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 14. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein the authorization unit comprises:

a personal identification number input unit ((column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26).

Voit does not explicitly disclose an authorization unit which also includes a smart card reader, a biometric input unit, and a voice recognition unit. Gullman discloses the use of a smart card, biometric input and a voice recognition unit for use in a computer system. Gullman states that the use of the biometric input provides a system which a user does not have to "remember the number or password" (column 1 lines 45 – 50).

Art Unit: 2131

Since the system of Voit uses a computer to initiate and handle the calls, it is obvious that an authorization unit can be added to a computer port. Biometric authentication is well-known in the art and is disclosed by Gullman. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the authorization unit of Gullman in conjunction with the authorization system to provide a biometric alternative to the password input of Voit, increasing individual security by precluding a hacker who has gained access to the account number and password to feign that he is the actual user and place unauthorized calls.

Claim 31 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 30. Furthermore, Voit discloses:

The system of claim 30, wherein the authorization unit comprises:

a personal identification number input unit ((column 9 lines 44 – 55, column 13 lines 14 – 51, column 17 lines 62 – 65, column 19 lines 20 – 26).

Voit does not explicitly disclose an authorization unit which also includes a smart card reader, a biometric input unit, and a voice recognition unit. Gullman discloses the use of a smart card, biometric input and a voice recognition unit for use in a computer system. Gullman states that the use of the biometric input provides a system which a user does not have to “remember the number or password” (column 1 lines 45 – 50).

Since the system of Voit uses a computer to initiate and handle the calls, it is obvious that an authorization unit can be added to a computer port. Biometric authentication is well-known in the art and is disclosed by Gullman. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the authorization unit of Gullman in conjunction with the authorization system to provide a biometric alternative to the password input of Voit, increasing individual security by precluding a hacker who has gained access to the account number and password to feign that he is the actual user and place unauthorized calls.


Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 703-305-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
10/27/04


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100